

REMARKS**Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

Briefly, the present invention relates to a system and method for automatically adjusting what information is presented on a computer based on detecting the clearance levels of various smart badge wearers who enter and leave from time to time a predetermined physical boundary, such as a workroom. The information presented on the computer is restricted to the lowest clearance level of a smart badge wearer currently within the physical boundary and thus avoids disclosing higher clearance level information to those who are not permitted access to it. The whole process is automatic using beacons, so that smart badge wearers need not manually badge themselves in as they enter the room or manually badge themselves out as they leave the room. The system and method envisions that as few as one smart badge wearer up to any number of smart badge wearers will be within the physical boundary (e.g. visible) at any one time.

In paragraph 4 of the Office Action, the Examiner has rejected independent claims 1 and 13 as being unpatentable over “U. S. Patent 6,351,813 issued to David M. **Mooney** et al. (hereafter “**Mooney**”).”

Amended independent claim 1 now claims “using a wireless beacon to detect which smart badges are located within a predefined physical boundary; identifying a lowest clearance level assigned to the smart badges within the boundary; and providing access to that sub-set of the database information having a clearance level no higher than the lowest identified clearance level on a computer located with the predefined physical boundary.”

Antecedent basis for these amendments are found on page 7 line 4; page 10 lines 7 and 18 – 19; and page 13 lines 6 – 10.

Mooney does not teach or suggest the claimed using a wireless beacon to detect which smart badges are located within a predefined physical boundary and thereby restricting information access within said boundary. Instead **Mooney** is limited to those who manually enter their smart card into a smart card reader (column 1 lines 59 – 62). Also, in the **Mooney** reference if a higher clearance level person has badged in, the computer will still display the higher clearance level information even though another person having a lower clearance level may have entered the area, resulting in a possible security breach.

Independent claim 1 is also distinguishable from the U. S Patent 5,629,981 issued to Virupax M. **Nerlikar** (hereafter “**Nerlikar**”). **Nerlikar** does not, even in view of **Mooney**, teach or suggest the claimed “using a wireless beacon to detect which smart badges are located within a predefined physical boundary” and “providing access to that sub-set of the database information having a clearance level no higher than the lowest identified clearance level on a computer located with the predefined physical boundary.” Instead of simultaneously detecting multiple smart badge wearers and adjusting what information is displayed on a computer screen where said smart badge wearers are located as is claimed in claim 1, **Nerlikar** (column 4 lines 21 – 24) merely is set to detect and authorize only one user at a time to access an information network. Also, in **Nerlikar** even if a higher clearance level person had “handshaked” with the RFID device, the computer would still display the higher clearance level information even though another

person having a lower clearance level may have entered the area, resulting in a possible security breach. Also the dynamic change in **Nerlikar** (column 13 lines 55-67) is one that still must be manually changed for a “specific period of time” and automatically cancels such access once that time period has expired. In contrast, claim 1 includes a beacon which detects smart badges in real-time and does not require manual time period configuration.

Independent claim 1 is also distinguishable from the “U. S. Patent 5,917,425 issued to James W. **Crimmins** et al. (hereafter “**Crimmins**”). **Crimmins** does not, even in view of **Mooney**, teach or suggest the claimed “providing access to that sub-set of the database information having a clearance level no higher than the lowest identified clearance level on a computer located with the predefined physical boundary.” Instead **Crimmins** is merely a position/location monitor (column 2 lines 15-16, and 24-26; and column 6 lines 15-18). **Crimmins** uses beacons to detect a person’s location but does not update a computer display co-located with said person with information having varying clearance levels.

Therefore, amended independent claim 1 is now in condition for allowance, along with all claims depending thereon.

Independent claim 13 has also been amended in a same manner as independent claim 1. Applicant respectfully asserts that independent claim 13 is allowable for at least the same reasons as discussed with respect to independent claim 1, along with all claims depending thereon.

In paragraph 5 of the Office Action, the Examiner has rejected independent claims 12 and 20 as being unpatentable over **Mooney** in view of **Nerlikar**.

Independent claims 12 and 20 have also been amended in a same manner as independent claim 1 and dependent claim 2. Applicant respectfully asserts that independent claims 12 and 20 are allowable for at least the same reasons as discussed with respect to independent claim 1.

In paragraph 6 of the Office Action, the Examiner has rejected independent claim 21 as being unpatentable over **Mooney** in view of **Crimmins**.

Independent claim 21 has also been amended in a same manner as independent claim 1. More specifically, amended claim 21 claims “a set of smart badges, detected by the first beacon to be within a predefined physical boundary, each badge assigned one of the clearance levels”; “a computer located within the boundary”; and “a software application, coupled to the service module and the database, for providing access to that sub-set of the information within the database having a clearance levels no higher than the lowest identified clearance level on the computer”.

Applicant respectfully asserts that independent claim 21, along with all claims depending thereon, are allowable for at least the same reasons as discussed with respect to independent claim 1.

In the event that the Examiner finds any remaining impediment to the prompt allowance of these claims that could be resolved by a telephone conference, please contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,
Mehrban Jam

Date: 9/5/03

By: 

Lloyd E. Dakin Jr, Reg. No. 38,423
Hewlett-Packard Company
1501 Page Mill Road, MS: 1197
Palo Alto, CA 94304-1126
TEL: (650) 857-2295
FAX: (650) 852-8063